III. Remarks

Claims 2 and 4-7 remain pending.

The examiner closed prosecution on the merits and indicated that all of the pending claims were allowable except for formal matters.

More specifically, the examiner indicated that an inconsistency existed in claim 1 and that "flow restriction" should be --flow restrictor—in two places. However, claim 1 had been cancelled in the prior amendment.

It is therefore believe that the examiner was intending to refer to claim 2 as having the inconsistency. To avoid any confusion in the record as to what is/was to be amended by the examiner, the applicants are submitting this *Ex parte Quayle* communication in which claim 2 is affirmatively amended in conformance with the examiner's suggested inconsistencies.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are now in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

August 12, 2005
Date

Eric J. Sosenko (Reg. No. 34,440)

EJS/

Attachment: None

BRINKS HOFER

PAGE 5/5 * RCVD AT 8/12/2005 1:47:34 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:17349946331 * DURATION (mm-ss):01-02